ان الدين عند الله الاسلام

The REVIEW of RELIGIONS

Vol. XXXVI, No. 6

June, 1937

CONTENTS

- **The Revolt of the Modern Woman—II**
  —Muhammad Hussain, B. C
- **War or Peace ?—III**
  —F. A. W
- **Changing Church Creed**
- **Cross *versus* Swastika—II**
  (M. G.
- **Church and State**
  Muhammad Hussain, B. C

Editor :
LAM FARID MALIK, M.A.

Head Office :
QADIAN, Punjab : India.

Branch Office :

AHMAD
AND
His Claims and Teachings
IN HIS OWN WORDS

In 2 Volumes of 300 Pages each, 6th Edition.

Price of each As. 8. Postage Free.

The Secretary :
ANJUMAN-I-TARAQQI-I-ISLAM, Secunderabad (Dn.)

IF . .
YOU WANT TO KNOW

What Islam Stands for, what is its message for humanity, how does it seek to raise man from the lowest depths of degradation to the highest pinnacles of glory—economically, morally & spiritually

READ

AHMADIYYAT OR THE TRUE ISLAM

BY

Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad

HEAD OF THE AHMADIYYA COMMUNITY AND THE GREATEST LIVING AUTHORITY ON ISLAM

The book deals in a simple and lucid manner, briefly but fully and completely, with all the different aspects of the teachings of Islam.

BOOK DEPOT, QADIAN, Pb., India

The

Review of Religions

Vol. XXXVI JUNE, 1937 No. 6.

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده ونصلي على رسوله الكريم

THE REVOLT OF THE MODERN WOMAN—II

Islamic Purdah Explained

(MOHAMMAD HUSSAIN, B. COM.)

"Man for the field and woman for the hearth
Man for the sword and for the needle she;
Man with the head and women with the heart
Man to command and woman to obey;
All else confusion."

[Without God we fail in life, and the bitterest part of the failure for many is that even that beautiful and delicate thing marriage fails with the rest, "We are restless till we rest in Thee," and two restless hearts cannot be happy hearts even though they be joined together in the bonds of love.]

It is an age when altars tilt and temples tumble. In my last article I dealt at length with the new forces which are stirring the whole society, the spirit of sophistication which has imbued the once matter-of-fact youth and, lastly, the slap-dash courage of Mrs. Grundy who comes armed with new lances to tilt in the tourney of life.

Before, I resume the abandoned threads of narration, I pose a query for the benefit of the torch-bearers of the Feminist Movement. Is not all the trouble in the modern world over the sexual element in life the evidence of something abnormal and distorted in the very constitution of modern society? Or putting the matter in a different light; would it not turn out that if only men and women were set in just and healthy conditions, given real education and sufficient but reasonable means of self-expression, the sexual problem would be found very largely to have solved itself? I have no ready-made cast-iron answer tucked up my sleeves. I do not arrogate to myself the position of a judge, but nonetheless I have my own convictions that history will one day answer it with unmistakable affirmative. What, often and anon, leaps to the eye of every observer is that every mal-adjustment in our present social life tends to increase the amount of failure in true sex-morality. All our callous disregard of rampant social vices revenges itself upon us by confronting us with an increasing store of menacing problems, and all our sincere endeavours directed to the cure of social health of any sort result in quickening the pace of our moral progress.

Battle of Purity

If those who go wrong in sex matters are spoiling their lives at the core, which of us will not, if cynicism has not sucked dry the milk of human kindness endowed to him by nature, feel induced to bend his energies to redeem them from evil ways and to help to clean the world. In a society divorced from religion, people see young men and young women sowing tall wild oats and paving the path for a social calamity. They feel grieved and distressed, but are at a loss for a sovereign remedy. Even when they hazard suggest one, it turns out to be worse than the disease. They witness the bankruptcy of human intellect, and turn to religion. They feel that religion is not a mere possibility: it is a necessity if life is ever to seem complete. And even with the young the life that is without religion is of necessity

an unbalanced life. Parts of the man or woman concerned are inactive, and the other parts occupy too much of the stage. Till an interest is awakened in God —so much so that man's whole being is suffused with the divine idea, he is lost in the maze of materialism. Till the spirit is awake and alive, the body obtrudes itself too much on human consciousness. And thus man fights the battle of purity on wrong terms. Nothing is so inspiring, nothing so cleansing of dross and dirt, nothing so protective against social dislocations as the revealed word of God.

I have digressed and not without purpose. It is to register a vigorous protest against a mundane attitude of mind, which seeks solution in the realm of matter. It is to challenge the fast-spreading notion that religion is an appendage to life, and is well kept in an outhouse like a motor bike, to be used when occasion calls. It is to prove that our social evils born of sexual maladjustment which have survived mundane remedies, will soon disappear, if religion is brought to bear on our lives. It is to plead that no discipline is so bracing, so purifying as the discipline of religion. Religion, only a revealed religion, revealed for all times and climes, can claim to lay a healing balm on the lacerated heart of humanity.

Post-War Women

Dr. Freud broke upon the world with his chant of the glory of sex. He told the world that every event in this world of brick and mortar was interpretable in terms of sex. His own land (Europe) proves the truth of his thesis. Moral chaos there, is the outcome of the maladjustment of sex. In the 20th century the female of the species seems to advance faster than the male. It was first hailed as a healthy sign of Feminine Renaissance. But the engineers of this great social movement now find themselves hoist with their own petard. At no time within recent history did women knock more loudly and persistently at the doors of public offices than in years after the Great War, when the cry went up that men were bunglers and brought the world crashing about our ears and must

give place to women who could not with all their physical handicaps make a worse bungle of it. This extravagant claim has startled men out of their pleasant reverie. They now discuss New the Woman in terms which indicate that they have lost all their sneaking admiration for women with faces "outraged with rouge," hair permed, noses shaped, eye-brows pencilled and trained, legs naked and tatooed, finger and toe nails tinted and further armed with " starchy decencies and linen distinctions." Women sought their emancipation under the plea that they could not rest content with being dolls in a doll's house. They were released from domestic drudgery in the fond hope that they might prove "better kind of women", a consummation devoutly sought by Swift in England and Montesquieu in France. But instead of proving " better" the New Women has turned out to be more independent, and is impatient of the present race of men. She wants a better kind of man, and resorts more to clubs than to her house. This has precipitated the Clash of "Two Spheres", which has been further accentuated by women invading the fields of employment. She has deepened and broadened the breadline. Now everybody feels that "more women at the counter mean more men on the dole." If Democracy continues to be as indulgent to women as it is to-day and continues to attach more value to them in other capacities than as wives and mothers and persists in enforcing a mathematical equation between two sexes, the future of men is very gloomy. They will go to the wall or might earn their bread as bishops and undertakers, and women would either refuse to be wives, or, helpless before biological urges, might inaugurate the System of "Motherhood by Proxy." What sort of world this would be, can better be imagined than described.

India's New Woman

Europe alone is not worried by the sex problem, though it has the pride of being the first to breed the race of petticoats and blue-stockings. The shock has come nearer home. India, long famous in history for

her ideal womanhood, is experiencing the pangs of the birth of the New Woman. India's New Woman has all the qualities and qualifications, of her prototype in the West. As it has been graphically described, "New Woman thinks not of charm—as it was understood in the old days—but of efficiency. Her movements are often abrupt and self-conscious and her gait has lost the old dignity. To cover her centuries-old shyness she raises her voice unnecessarily and is often irritatingly self-assertive. Her glance is more like that of the hunter than the hunted so that the mere man has often to cast down his eyes in embarrassment. She scorns the old-fashioned beauty hints of India and depends on Coty and Evening in Paris to enhance her charm.

"The New Woman can keep away bees and butterflies and incidentally a few disease germs along with them by the volumes of smoke that issues from the cigarette held between lips that the touch of Tangee has robbed of their natural tint. Her clothes display more colour than taste—her feet are encased in impossible high heeled atrocities that are at once a negation to graceful walking. And yet, before casting the first stone at her, one should pause to consider her background.

"The modern, educated woman feels the social upheavel more, consciously or unconsciously; as for her it means a more complete uprooting of the old order than for man. Used, for countless generations, to bearing children and caring for the home she finds herself in a bewildering whirlpool. Her life seems to be one rush from attending college, playing tennis, driving cars, going to pictures, attending fashionable parties and taking part in amateur dramatics. Marriage is an accident rather than the natural goal. From childhood, through adolescence to full blown womanhood, she thinks more of logic, philosophy, political economy, parties—and having a good time than of man as mate and little lives to fill her life and a home where to realize the peculiar genius a woman as a

wife, a mother and home maker. So—let us not judge her too harshly and let us remember that the New India woman is the product of a dynamic age."

Muslim Women Enter New World

There can be no better description of the New Woman who like Hamlet is already too much in the sun. The enormous nature of the problem set by the New woman would become all the more evident when we pass in review the social conditions in the world of Islam. Moslem Society has succumbed to the corrosive influence of the western ideas and ideals. It is the lack of the proper understanding of the principles of Islam, which is responsible for the tragic overhaul of Moslem Society. That the New Woman has invaded Moslem Society is proved by Ruth Frances Woodsmall's book, *Moslem Women Enter A New World*. Some Moslem women of great note and learning have reviewed the book with great gusto. One of them in her comment says "The author (Woodsmall) is quite right in saying "Even where conservatism is most strongly entrenched one finds at least a quiver of new life," and "Just as the wave-lengths of the radio are not blocked by walls, so new ideals are finding their way into the walled-in seclusion of the Moslem women's life. India represents the extreme of Conservatism in reference to the customs of seclusion," but "everywhere in the East it is the women of the towns and cities that have to face the problems of the veil and women in rural areas are not concerned with it, as this custom never existed among them." A Moslem woman in Alexandria told the author, "a veil, however high or low, thick or thin, remains a veil.....It is a sign of utter dependence and also of freedom from responsibility a handicap to real progress." "In Turkey women are now completely freed of veil."

Woodsmall has written this and much more. But as Islamic Purdah is the central theme of my narrative I confine myself to this small quotation in a

review by a Moslem woman of the Punjab. This depicts the intensity of revolt against Purdah. Before I pass on to the discussion of the institution, its form and nature, I must aver that the New Woman in Moslem Society has confounded change with true progress. It is the distinction between the two words which educated must learn to understand before they proceed to protest against Islamic principles. They must first decide whether their movement for their rights shall express itself as in Egypt within the framework of the law of Islam retaining all that is good in that superb culture or whether they follow Turkey in saying: "we have only one goal—progress. We recognise no relationship between religion and progress, since social progress is blocked if contingent on religion." These are the words of a leader in the Turkish Parliament. It is the choice which will decide the destiny of Islamic Civilisation. But the pointers are towards disintegration, because modern Muslim women betray a strong inclination towards Turkey. In social affairs, they seem to have transferred their allegiance from Mecca to Istanbal. But that they succeed in copying is only superficial tinsel and *crepe de chine* pose. They want to have more freedom, but less responsibility. They devour with avidity the pages of James Joyce and Aldous Huxley, but know not a word of the Holy Quran. It is this ignorance of Islam which sustains their false complacency and spurs them on in their headlong flight into regions where moral values are at their lowest, and marriage is regarded an accident. It is this sorry state of affairs which calls for an exposition of Islamic law bearing on this problem. The social reshuffling in Europe, and the wave of reaction against Feminine Movement prove that woman's place is by the hearth and cradle, and not on the public forums. Those who believe otherwise belie Biology and suffer consequently in the shape of wrecked homes and ruined families. The necessary sequel to this domestic topsyturvydom when a wife takes more pride in Baby Austen than in Baby is that the latter has to be dropped on the door-step of the Foundling Hospital as Rousseau

did. The result is obvious. The future generation would be destitute of moral stamina. If a woman is to be misplaced, nothing can save nations from degeneration.

Wrecking Family Life

The foregoing discussion abundantly proves that a woman, leaving her house like a somnambulist and entering the brawl of outside world, has bred all the chaos. This promiscuous intermingling of the two sexes is not only not conducive to social welfare, but is highly demoralizing. It plays havoc with family life. It leads to wrong conception, about such matters as marriage and the rearing of children and the duties that a man and a woman joined in wedlock owe to each other. Only a judicious balancing of mutual relations will set right the dislocation which is taking place everywhere.

Comparisons are odious. But they become inevitable when they lead to the discovery of some sovereign remedy. Men and women have their own peculiar duties to discharge. So long as they stick to their own allotted task, no confusion does arise. A woman cannot and should not try to oust man and usurp his duties as a bread-winner of a family. If she does she will soon find herself up against an impossible course. A masculine woman is as great a parody as an effeminate man. But the irony is that while people decry the latter, they betray a sneaking admiration for the former. The result is that women turn their back upon their natural tasks and venture forth into Amazonian feats, and men are left to take care of the hearth and the cradle. Aristotle has given an almost accurate description of the duties of both man and woman. He says, "woman is an unfinished man left standing on a lower step in the scale of development. The male is by nature superior, and the female inferior; the one rules and the other is ruled; and this principle extends, of necessity to all mankind. Woman is weak of will, and therefore incapable of independence of character or position; her best

condition is a quiet home life in which while ruled by the man in her external relations, she may be in domestic affairs supreme. Woman should not be made more like man as in Plato's Republic; rather the dissimilarity should be increased because nothing is so attractive as the different. The courage of a man and that of a woman are not, as Socrates supposed, the same: the courage of a man is shown in commanding; that of a woman in obeying. As the poet says "silence is a woman's glory."

The above passage makes a near approach to the Islamic formula about the mutual relationship of a man and a woman. In a verse, the Holy Quran says unequivocally that men are superior to women and their lords. Islam does not stop short but goes further and chalks out a programme for social adjustment. It is in social problems that Islam beats hollow all other rival religions. Sir Theodore Morrison bears out the truths of this assertion when he writes, "The truth is that Islam is more than a creed, it is a complete social system; it is a civilization with a philosophy, a culture, and an art of its own; in its long struggle against rival civilisation of Christendom it has become an organic unit conscious of itself."

The excellence of Islamic society is that men and women are juxtaposed in a healthy relationship of co-operators and not competitors spoiling for a fight as we find them in the West. While providing a full scope for the development of all her faculties, it lays the scene of a woman's activities within the four walls of the house. It does not mean that women are to be consigned to eternal incarceration. Far from that. What it forbids is promiscuity of sexual intercourse. It allows liberty but prohibits licence. A woman always standing at a market place, or figuring on a public platform, or daring men in political arenas, or always plying pen to win cheap notoriety, or pining for a non-stop flight to the utter neglect of her domestic duties, is not enjoying liberty but following the path of licence.

Purdah is an Islamic institution which undertakes

to regulate sexual relations. But it is known less for what it is than what it is not. All sorts of fantastic interpretations have been offered to make it look inhuman, and thus create occasions for casting aspersions on Islam which has exalted purdah into a sacred social institution. It is only in harmony with biology and psychology when Islam declares the physical and mental inequality of men and women. It does take into account sexual characteristics which make for superiority and inferiority. But, all the same, it does not detract from the civic dignity of women. It grants women an equally important position in the economy of life. They are to be consulted in important matters. They are to be free in actions which pertain to their peculiar sphere, which is not man's creation, but the work of Nature. Matriarchy has no place in Islam, because it is a fruitful source of all sorts of corruptions. The conception of equality and fellowship between men and women is an idea at least as old as Plato and one that has revived wherever civilisation has reached a phase in which men and women were sufficiently released from militant and economic urgency to talk and read and think. But it has never yet been, at least in the historical period and in any but isolated social groups, a working structural idea. The working structural idea is and has always been the Patriarchical Family in which the woman is inferior and submits herself and is subordinated to the man—the head of the family. In a patriarchical family a woman as free as man, obsessed with independence and feigning ignorance of her social handicaps for the virile duties, is not only an anachronism, but a positive danger to family itself. It is to obviate this danger that Islam commands women to observe Purdah.

In the definition of Purdah itself, there have arisen serious differences even among the Muslims, some of whom have tried to get round this important injunction by excluding face from the range of Purdah. Such people hold Purdah to imply that woman should abstain from the throngs of men. But they can go about

their business with their faces uncovered; only the bosom need be covered. The injunction about Purdah and other salutary restrictions on men and women in their social intercourse is contained in a big verse of the *Sura Nur* (The Light). This runs as follows: "Tell the believers to lower their gaze and to guard all the likely inlets of evil; this will be a source of great purity for them and God knows what they do. And tell the believing women to lower their gazes and guard the likely inlets of evil, and not to display their charms except what is external thereof and let them cover up their necks, heads, and faces and display their charms except to their own husbands, or their fathers, or the fathers of their husbands or their sons, or the sons of their husbands or the sons of their sisters, or their women or their slaves, or such male servants as have no desire for women, or such boys as are not yet aware of the relations between the sexes; and let them not slap their feet, with the intent to display their hidden beauty; and turn to God all ye who believe so that you may be successful." (XXIV: 29, 30). A similar injunction occurs in *Sura Ahzab* which contains a historical reference to the condition of those days. The verse runs as follows: "O Prophet, tell your wives and daughters and other believing women that they should hang over them their covering cloth. This will distinguish them from non-believing women and will ensure security against molestation."

Some commentators, a majority of whom belong to the present times, betray a sneaking admiration for western attitude towards women by interpreting face as a "Zero Zone" not to be invaded by even a stray fold of the covering cloth. This interpretation does not stand in the presence of the long verse quoted from *The Nur* (The Light). There is a clear command for jealously safeguarding the likely inlets of evil, because Islam seeks to close all the avenues of evils. Face mirrors forth the beauties and charms of women. It is the switchboard of all emotions and sentiments. One reacts to the face sooner than to any other limb, and the reactions instantly stamp themselves on it.

The baring of breast or the exposure of any other part of woman's body would smack of savage ways and would be too indecent, too repulsive, too " naked " to attract any but a most sexual pervert. While a fair face unfortified by the opaque walls of veil stirs up irresistible passions and disturbs the even tenor of social life. Seductions and abductions occur with awful frequency.

Face, in short, is not merely an inlet but the gateway of evils. Unless it is locked and secured, one is not safe and the Quranic injunction remains unfulfilled. Many commentators of great note also hold that face is not to be left uncovered. Hazrat Ibn-i-Abbas says that Allah has commanded believing women to hang their covering cloth before their face from over their heads, whenever they have to come out in the public. Hazrat Obeidah-bin-Suffian-bin-Al-Haris-Al-Huframi was once asked to explain the veil as enjoined by the verse. He straightaway demonstrated it on his own person by covering up his forehead, nose and one eye, keeping the other eye open.

Ibni Jareer Tabbri also offers the same interpretation. He says that Muslim women can only avoid being taken for bond-girls by not keeping their head and face naked.

(To be continued)

WAR OR PEACE ?—III

Social Structures

We should in reading history, when looking at the maps, try to build in our minds solid structures, pyramids or cones, high, low, or medium, according to the democratic or aristocratic state of society at the time. This will help us to understand many historical happenings. It will help us to understand one of the causes of wars. Also how nations rise to power through conification, if carried to a certain extent, but not too far.

A savage people is never highly conified. The king is but a little superior to his people either in wealth, power or personal ability. With the accumulation of property of a more or less permanent kind, such as grain, sheep, cattle, land, and so forth, there take place the handing on of riches to the next generation. Men of wealth, success, and ability bring their children to marry one another. They have now something to leave to the coming generations. They become particular on the point of knowing who their children are. Marriage and legitimacy of descent are demanded. Genealogies are preserved. Biological heredity is at work as usual, therefore by a process of selection (almost artificial selection, as among domestic animals) a caste is formed of individuals endowed with an excess of precisely those qualities that their ancestors have exhibited during their own lives, namely ambition and the love of power, wealth, and leadership, glory and family pride.

Heart of Problem

These forces may culminate in autocracy. When they do we have a natural structure very well adapted for belligerency, and very prone to fight. But, as we all know, wars are not by any means confined to "Junker" nations, and history shows that the more

democratic communities have carried on a great many wars though not quite so many as the highly conified groups.

Some writers who are devoted to economic studies and to the economic interpretation of history are disposed to find in economic strain the chief cause of war. It may be true that most periods of war have an economic or commercial origin. But so do most periods of peace. Self-seeking groups cause war, and self-seeking groups still continue to function during long periods of peace. Economic pressure and the food supply problems are always with us. Therefore, being constant and continuous, it does not get at the heart of the problem to explain the war periods by a factor that is always more or less with us.

Let us suppose, for instance, that by some miraculous discovery food and clothing could be produced at will. Would there not still be left plenty of reasons for war? Rich men do not cease to seek more power simply because they have enough to eat. Knowing as we now do that all these matters of human behaviour are dependent on inherited and persistent instincts, we can well enough understand why the power-seeking instinct of the rich compels them to keep on working for themselves and their families, and also why there is always preserved in every geographically separate group of mankind an instinct of human though ancient origin that can best be called a war-willing instinct. People are not anxious to go to war, but they are willing. And this war-willing instinct is likely to remain for many generations to come.

Geographical Alignments

Emphasis should be placed on the word geographical. Wars are essentially geographical or topographical in the alignment of the participants. It is the tribe over the other side of the mountain that naturally we fear, hate, and fight. Racial differences and racial hatreds are as nothing compared to geographical alignments. To make this clear, consider for a moment

by way of illustration the lesson taught by the seven million inhabitants of the city of New York. Here are all races of the world living together and getting on together very well indeed. The races are somewhat segregated into neighbourhoods, but the neighbourhoods are scattered. It is scarcely like that the different races will start in to make war against each other. But let us suppose that all the land on the earth's surface sank out of existence except New York City and Chicago and the strip of land between the two. Even if there were plenty of land left to support everyone in comfort, it is just as certain as anything can be that Chicago and New York would begin to quarrel and to hate each other and to fight.

Natural Splitting

All sections of the United States are held together in harmony as a single organic aggregate, and there is no tendency for one section to make war on any other section. But that does not mean that the same peaceful condition would continue if the United States were the only nation in the world. The United States is a great living entity. All living things have been evolved side by side with their enemies, have always had enemies, and as far as we can see perhaps need enemies to maintain their existence. The United States like all other geographical groups is held together as a single nation because of powerfully potential enemies lying outside of itself. The number of people living peacefully under one League of Nations can consequently be conceived of as growing and growing but only upto a natural limit, beyond which it cannot grow, and that limit is determined as soon as there is no external enemy equal in power to itself. In other words, half the earth may be under one League of Nations but not the whole of it. And not much more than half, for after that the outward enemy is no longer threatening enough to prevent the natural splitting within the great aggregate, dependent on the fact that the selfish interests of one section are sure to be different from those of another. It is conceivable to have a

whole earth united, but only if we are attacked by the inhabitants of Mars.

"Fear God and take our own part"

It is a curious fact that always during periods of peace it is very difficult to believe that civilized human beings should be willing to engage in the horrors of "brutal" warfare. That is because the war-willing instinct is a separate emotion from the peace-willing instinct. All emotions are soon forgotten. It is very easy for good visualizers to remember pictures and for people with good auditory memories to recall sounds. But few of us have such apparatus for recalling former bodily experiences or states of bodily feeling, particularly unpleasant ones. That is the reason why in summer we never expect again to feel the cold, and in winter we never dread the heat of summer. War is to a certain extent like sea-sickness, horrible while it lasts, but in a little while on shore we are over it and it is soon forgotten; and furthermore, when ashore we do not believe that we will ever be sea-sick again. After every great war most men are pacifists.

A nation at war and a nation at peace are two very different entities, but they are equally normal and, so far as history teaches us, equally usual. Man's instinct for war is no greater than his instinct for peace, and were it possible to eliminate all of the economic and other external causes of war, war itself could then probably be eliminated. But, obviously, these external causes cannot be eliminated in a fell swoop. Who is to do the eliminating? And by what practical agency is such a complex programme to be carried out? During the process man's normal hereditary reactions to stimuli continue operative, inducing him, upon occasion, to fight. For these reasons war may be abolished in time, but not for a great many generations, and peace-wishing though we may be, let us not close our eyes to the facts or ignore the enormous difficulties in our path. In the meantime we must "fear God and take our own part". As time goes on the world is bound to be governed by those best able to govern it. Shall it be ourselves?

CHANGING CHURCH CREED

The intellectual charity which inspired the primitive Church was destined first to decline and at length to vanish. It vanished with the development of three features in Church organization—a written creed, a New Testament Canon, and a professional clergy. Whether these were related to the change in temper as effect to cause or as cause to effect, the proximity in time seems too striking to have been accidental. A superficial glance at the record of creed-making has suggested one explanation, so obvious as to be widely taken for granted, and yet far too simple to do justice to the complex facts.

It was in the fourth century that men began to demand distinct, clear-cut and exclusive definitions of "what must be believed". In that century the first of the great Œcumenical Councils met, and a document was drawn up, with the formality of a legal contract, declaring the Christian Faith to involve several abstruse metaphysical propositions. The Council was the forerunner of others in which, after long and often acrimonious debate, dogma was made at once more elaborate, more precise, and more imperative. One is bound to note that these gatherings were first held, and first fulminated anathemas against individual opinion, after the Church had been taken under civil patronage and Christianity had been proclaimed the official religion of the Roman Empire. It was the Emperor Constantine himself who presided at the opening Council of Nicæa. Hence the facile guess that the idea of rigorous Church authority, and the prevention of personal eccentricities in worship or even belief, had been caught by contagion from imperial usage in politics. Plainly the later developments of papal jurisdiction were an inheritance from that vanished Empire with which the Church had been associated and into whose image it had been transformed.

Perhaps, then [the whole scheme of creeds was copied from Roman legislation, and the canon law was but a spiritual correlate of the civil law? A natural consequence, when the Church has come under the tutelage of what St. Paul called "principalities and powers"!

But to account for the creeds in this way is to neglect the more obscure as contrasted with the more patent facts of the record. It was no doubt through the new self-consciousness of the Church as a branch of the Empire that heresy began to suffer its sharpest persecution. But it was not thus that heresy first came to be recognized and forbidden.

Every society must have some basis of membership. Though the framing of a Christian creed was comparatively late, and though it is the ingenuity of later interpretation which has found mature dogma in the earliest faith, there was very soon an accumulating tradition of what was believed by Christians in general. At first it was not judged neccessary to define this with sharpness in a standard of doctrine, but the data were being consolidated through the first three centuries. The oldest attempt at a clear formulation is the short statement known as *The Apostles' Creed.* No one can tell who constructed it, or when it was constructed, though there is evidence that it is at least as old as the second century. Tertullian speaks of such short affirmations, put together out of some fragment of a hymn or some doxology in habitual use, to serve as a token of introduction by which a visitor might be accredited to a church where he was not known. He compares it to that earthenware symbol, the *tessera hospitalis* broken in halves, of which one half is kept by each of two friends, that it may be used as a letter of indentification in communicating with the other. By such means a messenger, for example, was authenticated. Not, however, until the troubled third and fourth centuries was any effort made to devise such tokens for the Catholic Church. They had previously served only a local purpose, circulating between districts, and as various as the districts

themselves. But there were reasons why some method of securing uniformity must in time be taken. A bewildering conflict of rival doctrines about the universe and man distracted the world of Roman civilization to which the first Christian preachers appealed. Mixed, too, with all manner of philosophic or theosophic speculation about ultimate things was a maze of ritual, often suggestive of the Christian Sacraments. St. Paul had this in mind when he twitted the Athenians with being too religious. If the Faith of the Church was not to be lost, it had to be distinguished not only from what flatly contradicted it, but also from what more or less colourably resembled it.

Harnack, in his *History of Dogma*, has given a different account of creed-making. For him, the purpose was not so much to distinguish as to accommodate. He thinks that the elaborating of simple faith into doctrinal subtleties was due to infection from the pagan thought by which the early Church was surrounded. The Galilean Message, he says, was thus translated into terms of an intricate philosophy, for the benefit of philosophers at Alexandria or Antioch, and in the course of this it suffered disastrous change. Much can be cited, especially from the Fourth Gospel, which is held to have been written late, showing how appeal was made to speculative thinkers in a language that suited them. Hence, in Harnack's view, began that corrupting of a faith once expressed in the *Sermon on the Mount*, which made it almost unrecognizable in a *Nicene Creed* about the Trinity and in an *Athanasian Creed* about the terms of salvation.

—*Modernism, Past Present and Future*

CROSS *Vs.* SWASTIKA—II

The conflict between the National Socialist State and the Christian Churches has been going on for nearly four years. There is no sign of an end.

The leadership of the "Confessional Church" is now in the hands of those pastors who unconditionally rejected the "totalitarian" claims of the National Socialist State from the first. The Church has intensified its work in the parishes and has made a special effort to expound the dangers of the "totalitarian" claim to parents. A pamphlet, "Church, School, and Home," written in that clear, forceful German that marks all "Confessional" publications, has been circulated in thousands of copies. An order was issued for its confiscation, and the "Gestapo" seized all the copies they could lay hands on. But it is still being widely read.

In this pamphlet parishioners are exhorted to "fight without fear of man, so that the Evangelical Church may be preserved for your children's sake." Evangelical school teachers are exhorted to "do your duty . . . in open affirmation of faith in Jesus Christ." Of the State the pamphlet demands that "it gives the schools freedom and time for the unhindered affirmation of Christian truth."

It is characteristic of the religious policy of the National Socialist State that the police should be used to silence words such as these.

The "Confessional Church" made arrangements for special courses in Evangelical theology because the ordinary courses at the universities were placed under the influence of the State, which was thereby able to introduce its "totalitarian" doctrines. On October 17. 1936, the theological students at Berlin University were forbidden to take part in these special courses and were threatened with dismissal from the University in case of contravention. Special holiday courses were organised by the "Confessional Church" in Breslau. An order forbidding them was issued by the authorities,

and the pastor who was to be in charge was banished from Silesia (the province of which Breslau is the capital) for refusing to recognise the order.

Recent German leglislation has, on the whole, avoided the outward appearance of being anti-ecclesiastical, but the State has been impending, the work of the churches in many small ways that cumulatively amount to severe disabilities. For example when the annual "Winter Aid" (a collection made by the authorities for the ostensible purpose of relieving the hardships of the poor in winter) began, all collections for religious purposes were forbidden. The German press laws, which are not specifically directed against the churches, are used against them nevertheless. Many editors of ecclesiastical periodicals have been summoned to defend themselves against charges of being "politically unreliable," charges that are often quite vague and arbitrary. If their defence is considered inadequate their periodicals are suspended. Amongst the periodicals which the authorities have succeeded in extinguishing by this method are *Die Stimme der Gemedinde*, *Licht und Leben* and *Unter dem Wort*. These repressive measure, which are, as a rule, taken without due procedure of law, inflict a good deal of hardship not only in so far as they deprive the staffs of these papers of their livelihood, or of a labour that is usually a labour of love, but because they severely obstruct the work of enlightening and heartening the parishioners.

The difficulties and dangers of circulating printed, matter (and the expense, too, for the suppression of periodicals means a big financial loss to the "Confession-Church," which has very limited means in any case) have forced the "Confessional" clergy to circulate advice, exhortations, extracts from sermons, ecclesiastical news, and the like on duplicated sheets. The "Gestapo" has retaliated by confiscating the duplicators.

But all these and the many more repressive measures taken by the German authorities have remained

ineffective. The attitude of the "Confessional Church" has hardened as its difficulties have increased.

In the spring of 1936 the leading "Confessional" pastors submitted a long memorandum to Hitler. Although worded in respectful terms, this memorandum expressed an absolute determination to accept no compromise in matters relating to the essentials of the Christian faith. It even stigmatised the disabilities inflicted on the Jews in Germany and the very existence of concentration camps as being incompatible with Christian teaching. But neither Hitler nor any German authority even acknowledged having received a document which is one of the most memorable in German religious history.

An answer did, however, come after months had passed, and from an unexpected source—from Hitler's personal friend Julius Streicher.

On October 23 he addressed a meeting in the Herkuless-Saalbau at Nuremberg (his address was relayed to the Kolosseum and the Kulturverein in the same city). To the memorandum of the pastors, with its severe dignity of language, its broad humanity, its powerful and persuasive argumentation, and its deep religious feeling Herr Streicher replied as follows :—

A real fighter ought to be a Christian of deeds and not of words [" ein Christ der Tat"]. A mere "Confessional" will never have the strength needed to live in the great moments of the world's history. Through the salvation of the German people will come the salvation of those nations that cannot help themselves—it will come through Adolf Hitler. . . .

Then Ten Commandments were given to the Jews on Mount Sinai. They were given to us later on.

Herr Streicher then repudiated the Commandments, declaring: "It is not necessary to say to an honest man 'Thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not commit adultery . . .' "

He then broke out in obscene, unprintable language that was loudly cheered by his audience. Afterwards he continued :

I cannot listen to these parsons any longer. People who are paid for it have no right to say that they speak in the name of Heaven.

In this letter (the memorandum submitted to Hitler) it says that the Evangelical conscience is burdened by the fact that there are concentration camps in Germany. What the Evangelical pastor wants is to let the Communist mob out—he dare not say it in Germany, and so he says it abroad.

Herr Streicher then declard that he was grateful for the memorandum because it enabled him to expose the authors ("I was one of the first to tear the veil aside").

At the close of his address he callled the Confessional clergy traitors and the like : "We can do without your prayers. The flags in the Feldherrnhalle (the standards of the National Socialist movement in the insurrection of 1934 that are now kept in the Feldherrnhalle at Munich) will have been stained with sacred blood in vain if we do not dispose of the men who betrayed our people."

A further reply to the memorandum was made by the deputy "Gauleiter" Holz, at Horsbruck on October 27, 1936. Most of his speech is unprintable, but amongst other things he said :

If all Jews throughout the world were to be slain in a single night it would be the holiest festive day in the entire history of the world. . . . The Confessionals have had their memorandum published abroad in Jewish and èmigrè papers. They are traitors. . . . They want to have Thälmann set free. They are handymen of Bolshevism. Not with prayers but with the rattle or machine-guns is good work being done in Spain.

(M. G.)

CHURCH AND STATE

How Foes Became Friends and Vice Versa

(By Mohammad Hussain, B. Com.)

The story of the relations of Church and State reads like a romance rich in events of great historic interest. They began as foes and ended as friends, so much so that Church which once looked askance at State, became a handmaid of political despotism in the West. European monarchs requisitioned the services of churchmen as their emissaries to inculcate among the masses the belief of divine rights of kings and thus stemmed the tide of democratic ideas. But they could not go on indulging in pro-monarchical activities with impunity. No doubt, there were some in the rank and file of the churchmen who courted deaths and dangers to maintain the prestige of Church. But the kings were fast gaining ground upon them. The Church of Rome suffered the final collapse of its supreme authority in England in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. But this does not mean that Church went out of picture. It continued to possess an individuality and swayed the minds of the masses.

Anyhow the rivalry had ceased, and both the institutions had been pulling together very amicably for over a century. It might be argued that Church accepted to play second fiddle to State and improvise religious and spiritual sanctions to oil the wheels of political administration. But this itself indicates that the kings felt that they could not do without Church and that they would be tempting Providence by attempting to weaken the Church still further. Ecclesiastical blessings had always been regarded indispensable by the rulers, and important State ceremonies as coronation and succession are still performed under the auspices of Church.

Fall of Church in Russia

The mutual antagonism between State and Church has been revived by Communism and Nazism. Victim to long senile decay and possessing only a dubious hold over the people, because of her reputation as the catspaw of the tyrant Czars, the Church in Russia went under before the rising tide of Communism. The whole church hierarchy was disbanded, and allegiance to Church came to be regarded as a sufficient stimulus for State persecutions. Communism which was fast crystallising into a supreme force and philosophy, struck a blow at the very idea of religion. It could not think of anything better to cut away ground from under the feet of churchmen. The standard-bearers of Communism had grave misgivings about Church. They honestly believed that if they spared this institution they would be sowing dragon's teeth for them. They could not hustle on with their revolutionary activities without first giving a short shrift to a force which claimed a rival loyalty from the people and might any time confront them with menacing problems. Now after about two decades of relentless persecutions, Stalin regime has turned over a now leaf. It has relaxed its anti-Church activities. Church there is rallying, but it cannot restore herself to its pre-revolution strength.

Pope Holds His Own

After his epoch-making march on Rome and his assumption of a ruler's purple and powers, Mussolini saw one lion in his path, one thorn rankling in his side. It was the occupant of the Vatican. He saw his supremacy shared by the Pope who was also marking time. The Duce took courage in both hands and made a bold bid to live in Rome and fight with the Pope. He came to grips with the Vatican on the question of child's education. It was the flare-up of the long dead antagonism of Church and State. Both the opponents knew that future was with the one who won the child. They further knew that they could win this potential force only through a specially devised education. The

tug of war waxed hot. But the Duce got round the Vatican opposition by his characteristic trickery. The story of his historic interview is fully related in his biography *Sawdust Cæsar* and only faintly hinted by Emil Ludwig in his famous book *The Leaders of Europe*. It is said that on the day of his interview Rome presented a scene of siege. Men of note were interned and police pickets were posted at all strategic points. Military was also mobilised to a concert pitch. Amidst such elaborate precautions, the Duce dared interview His Holiness the Pope. He came out of the Vatican in a tremulous-triumphant state with his face still bearing the broad traces of some great humiliation suffered.

It is said that no sooner did he walk into the 'august' presence of the Pope than he fell at his feet and moistened them with his crocodile tears. The interview was only short-lived but very momentous. The Duce got the privilege of controlling the Child Education. But it was Pope's moral triumph. When he was asked whether he licked the dust before His Holiness, the Duce said that he did so as a Roman. Anyhow Church prevailed and State had to submit and surrender to win its point.

But in Germany it is a different tale. The Fuehrer has pressed on with his pogroms against Church, but the latter has shown more vitality than was expected of her. Ecclesiastic dignitaries have not lost heart. The struggle is now taking a new turn. It is sometime said that State will have to change its tune to stop the rot that has set in public life.

Trials of Early Christians

It is these circumstances which have thrown into sharp relief the question of Church-State rivalry. It will not be out of place to unfold the whole tale. For this we shall have to project our vision far back into the past when the creed of the prophet of Nazareth was yet in its infancy and Pauline innovations had just begun to colour Christian society.

It is a broad fact of history that Christianity had to bid good-bye to its land of birth and go to seek its fortune in a foreign strand. It was mostly in Rome that the Christian doctrines first struck their root and by a weary process grew into an institution of overshadowing importance. But in its early days it had to fight against heavy odds. The Roman Emperors were pagans and were never loath to exercise severe reprisals against Christian missionaries, not a few of whom underwent nameless tortures for their cause. At one time the persecutions were so sweeping and a Christian's life had become so cheap, that the Christian community had to retire into catacombs. This fact has been dealt at some length even in the Holy Quran in a big chapter called the Campanions of the Cave.

But the hostile State could not annihilate the creed of Christ. It was only hammering it into a more stable and durable shape. While it was gaining in strength, its tormentor was losing its age-old vitality. The period between the reign of Diocletian and the fall of the western Roman Empire saw the crystallisation of Roman-Christian system of law and an established Church. It was the result of the union of Church and State which brought about an amalgamation of their intellectual forces, their rights and powers and to a certain extent their system of Government. Had Tertullian been told that a time was coming when the Emperors would be Christian, he would have stigmatised the prophecy as impious. Had any man communicated to Decius that his persecuting edicts were the forerunners of the greatness of Church, he would have flouted it as absurd. It was because that as late as the third century, Church and State were irreconcilable opponents.

It was Emperor Constantine who recognized Church and granted her privilege. But this act is not abrupt. It has a long perliminary history of development in Church, which brought her more and more within the orbit of State.

Temporal Glory

The Christians of the first century, intoxicated with the idea of Divine Kingdom were indifferent to temporal glory. They had no soft corner for State which they regarded as the domain of Belial. They believed that the whole world "lieth in wickedness." But nonetheless there were some factors which sobered their abhorrence of State. For instance, they could not turn a blind eye to the fact that State punished evil-doers and worked for justice and peace. It protected them and punished Jews. Moreover Jesus and his Apostles had enjoined unquestioned obedience to rulers and complete submission to their penalties. The Christians, therefore, were in a very anomalous position as they felt like serving God and Mammon both.

In the realm of reason, they felt like aliens. They were to hold their reason in check before the supreme truth of the New Testament. Philosophy was there *bete noire*. But they were assailed by doubts about their convictions. They began to question themselves whether Socrates and Plato were mere "Vicars of Bray" and their philosophies mere fabrications full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. These sickening doubts and constant questionings mollified their attitude and they began to regard philosophy in a more generous light. This was the first step towards compromise with State.

Rise of Visible Church

In the second century, one witnesses the tendencies towards reconciliation with State. They were evident in more directions than one. First, the Christian community grew out of its old form of organisation. As early as the year 140, its organisation was the exact replica of Municipal Administration. They had provincial synods to co-ordinate their functions. The Protean changability of Christian doctrines favoured many innovations. Towards the end of the second century the Christian communities of East and

West evolved the idea of confederation, and instead of heavenly Church, there arose a visible institution extending from the Euphrates to Spain. It had its own laws and ordinances. It became a political Organisation with its boundaries coinciding roughly with the frontiers of the Roman Empire. This political orientation made Church a rival of State, but rivals may become friends.

Secondly, the Christians had, as the time passed on, to revise their attitude towards worldly life. As more and more people entered the fold of Christianity, it became more and more difficult to remain *other-worldly* and profess this belief in the public. In the reign of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius, Christians were numerous in every class of society. Now the question whether they should proclaim their faith and provoke state reprisals or keep quiet and save their skin stared the priests in the face. They decided not to be officious and said that the pursuit of worldly gains did not run counter to the requirements of genuine faith. This change took place in the beginning of the third century. Christians became peaceful and peaceable citizens of the State. Marcus Aurelius testifies to the spotless morality of the Christian subjects. It was another approach towards compromise with State.

Forging a New Link

Thirdly, there was nothing in the Christian doctrine to offend authorities. The use of the word "King" for Christ had a revolutionary twang in it. But the harmless life of Christians disarmed all suspicion. The teachings of Christianity about God, origin of the world, and other kindred topics did not offend philosophers. What appeared to be myth as Christ's miracles, crucifixion and his bodily ascension came to be expounded in philosophical light. Christ was held out as the Corporeal Manifestation of the *Logos*. It was to humour Hellenism. Origen—the most eminent churchman thought like Greek philosophers and thus forged a link between Christianity and

Greek philosophy. Such a fact favoured alliance between State and Church ; because no State can afford to ignore a movement which commands the allegiance of a number of its citizens.

Fourthly, the development of Christian literature played a conspicuous part in cementing the bonds between State and Church. In the beginning, the Christians sought to usurp Old Testament as their own. But Jews proved too strong in their rival claim. In the first century they had their writings, gospels and epistles in the form of *Memorabilia*. But the Gnostic party which arose between 140 and 170, began to cut garments of literature for Christian doctrines. There was a lurking danger of profanation, but nothing daunted, the pioneers of Christian literature spared no pains in enriching the ' scribbling ' art. Through the medium of literature, Church influenced the life of her followers, and State had perforce to view it in a different light. State could not look upon Church as a negligible quantity.

Christ's Creed in New Moulds

Fifthly, the gradual modification of the Christian forms of worship established a live contact between State and Church. At first the simple plain Christian worship did not appeal to the masses who could not conceive of worship without the paraphernalia of images, rituals and ceremonies. Some people expressed their chagrin by calling the Christians atheists. The Christians stuck to their guns. But time worked change. It was towards the end of the second century that some notable changes occurred in the forms of Christian worship. This appealed to Greco-Roman mind. For instance, it was after 190 that a separate class of priests arose in the Christian Church ; the Lord's Supper was elaborated into a solemn sacrificial rite; last but not least, Lord's Supper and other acts of public worship were invested with the glamour of mysteries. These changes made a near approach to Greek and Roman ceremonials. There began to

grow up about the Sacramental elements, the water of baptism, the sign of the Cross. This new growth simply captured the heathen mind. In short, Christians adjusted themselves to conditions in which they could act more freely in collaboration with non-Christians.

Sixthly, the Christian estimate of State was never completely hostile. The succession of generous emperors as Trajan, Hadrian Pius and Marcus Aurelius endeared State to the hearts of Christians. Even Luke had a dim sense of a certain solidarity between the Empire and Christianity, between Augustus and Christ.

II

In the seventy years that elapsed between the death of the Emperor Alexander Severus and the rise of Constantine, the stream of history did not carve out any new channel, but continued to flow in the old one.

The political organisation of Church went from strength to strength while State authority was falling into decay. There was a network of bishoprics and parishes which owed allegiance to Rome, where synods were held and were attended by Christians from all over Italy. Sixty years before the historic Council of Nicæa, a synod sat at Antioch and it was attended by bishops from the countries between the Halys and the Nile. Thus the episcopal confederation soon grew into *imperium in imperio*. It provoked persecution which did not help State much.

Aurelius, more shrewd than his predecessors, utilised the authority of the Church, to extend the influence of Rome in the East. When there arose a bitter quarrel at Antioch over the ownership of the property, Aurelius was made arbiter to adjudge between the disputants. He decided in favour of the party which maintained epistolary contact with the

city of Rome. Thus forty years before Constantine, Church referred her dispute for arbitration to the Roman Emperor who also acknowledged the existence of Church and her value as a pillar of imperial authority.

Remarkable Change

During the last decade of the third century, Christian life underwent a remarkable change. Christianity ceased to abhor world. But those who continued to hold the old time-worn views formed a separate class of ascetics, while other Christians came to terms with the world. They adopted all professions with a few exceptions. They proved ideal citizens with a striking sense of civic responsibility. No state could ignore such people without injuring its own interests. It is quite understandable that an era of amicable relations might have dawned long before Constantine if the Christians had learnt to tack their sails according to the breeze and had not insisted on certain stipulations.

The 'cheerless' Christian doctrines scared the pagans who could see nothing in Church to indulge their taste for images and idols. But they were soon on the mend. It redounds to Origen to weave Neo-platonism in the texture of Christian doctrines. He introduced allegoric method for interpretation. This rendered his position more and more acceptable to Greek philosophers. Strictly speaking, there were three points of difference between Christianity and Neo-platonism, which then was in the ascendant; the former taught the creation of world in time, the incarnation of *Logos* and the resurrection of the flesh; the latter rejected all these three doctrines. But the pupils of Origen believed in these in a way which did not differ from Neo-platonism. Christian philosophy, therefore, was in the mid-stream of intellectual movement, and State was left no alternative but to confer all civic rights on Christians.

Spirit of Compromise

The Christian literature did not lag behind. It had absorbed the spirit of the pagan literature, though it continued to bear a different label. The legends of apostles and martyrs took the place of the stories of heroes and gods. In short, a Christian shoot was grafted on the stem of Hellenism, the sap of which streamed forth into the branch.

Christian forms of worship evolved in tune with the requirements of pagan times. They became more mysterious, more rhetoric and more symbolic. The priests never hesitated to cater to the polytheistic leanings of the Christian masses. Church, thus, fixed herself in the affections of the people. No state would be well-advised to turn its back upon such an important institution.

With the passage of time State was rising in the estimation of Christians. In their heart of hearts, they believed that the Emperors who were generous to them were Christians in secret. This betrays a change in the viewpoint of Christians. They had ceased to regard Empire as incompatible with their doctrines. Origen by his writings had created a hope in the minds of Christians that, slowly but surely, they would attain glory even in this world. This is the antithesis of what the primitive Christians believed and hoped. In short, both the parties—Church and State—had come within sight of historic amalgamation. Only "misunderstanding" had got to be removed.

State Meets Half-way

So far I have traced the history of evolution of Church which brought herself closer and closer to State. But it must be remembered that it was not a unilateral move for peace. State also met half way the advances of Church. During the Imperial period the Roman State did not exercise any great influence on religious life of its citizens. It inculcated worship of Emperor.

But this did not fully satisfy the religious cravings of the masses. It, therefore, recognised as many forms of religions as it could. But this caused confusion. The desire for one universal comprehensive religion asserted itself. Before Constantine, attempts were made to invent such a creed but they failed. Christianity in its modified form chimed in with the humour of the time and came to form a basis of a new state.

State in the early days was as exclusive as Church. But it soon began to lose its exclusiveness and by steps drew near Church.

The development of the Roman law with stronger moral leaven was hailed by Christians with joyful assent. It was another overture made by State to Church.

The persecution of Church by Decius and Valerian proves that these emperors were aware of the potentalities of their rival. But they failed to achieve their ignoble end, and Church began to enjoy peace from 260 to 302. State felt that security lay in befriending and not estranging Church. The final act of amalgamation came to pass when Constantine accepted Christianity and set the Cross upon his standard. The two streams met in one common current of great volume and velocity. State became stronger and stabler after this union. Church also rose into prominence and brought forth men of greater distinction and commanding character.

III

Church's New Role

Henceforward Church began to rule the roost. The early Christian kings and emperors with the bubbling zeal of a new convert always looked to Church for light and guidance. This newly acquired supremacy filled the churchmen with inordinate pride and besides ecclesiastical functions they began to put their inconvenient

finger in every pie. What fed fat their pride was the blind belief of the Christian flock. People believed that Church "can do no wrong" and can do what it pretends to do. George Bernard Shaw gives a vivid picture of the power of The New Church. He writes: "The priest cannot only defy the police as the common sorceress cannot: he has only to convince a sufficient number of people of his divine mission to thrust the Government aside; assume all its functions except the dirty work that he does not care to soil his hands with and therefore leaves to "the secular arm"; take on himself powers of life and death, salvation and damnation; dictate what we shall all read and think; and place in every family an officer to regulate our lives in every particular according to his notions of right and wrong.

"This is not a fancy picture. History tells us of an emperor crawling on his knees through the snow and lying there all night supplicating pardon from the head of a church, and of a king of England flogging himself in the cathedral where a priest had been murdered at his suggestion. Citizens have been stripped of all their possessions, tortured, mutilated, burned alive, by priests whose wrath did not spare even the dead in their graves, whilst the secular rulers of the land were forced against their own interest and better sense, to abet in their furious fanaticism."

Cry of "No Popery"

Armed with such plenary powers, Church behaved like a "punch-drunk" boxer and urgently called for K. Os. which were not long in coming. Some kings arose who took serious exception to Church's ubiquitous influence which in no way conduced to public welfare. They defied papal interdicts and bulls and hedged the Church within reasonable limits. Men like Wycliff and Martin Luther exposed the rotten core of Church and people saw that the papal outbursts of indignation passed off in sheer thunders. The reaction against the priests went so far in Britain,

Switzerland, Holland and America that at the cry of "No Popery" every Roman Catholic trembled for his house and every priest for his life. When this New Theocracy organized itself as the Church of Rome its abuses provoked the Reformation in England and Northern Europe, and in France the wrath of Voltaire and the French Revolution. In both cases it was shorn of its powers and it became a hireling of Plutocracy. It again was no change for the better, because the revolt agaist the "Haves" was bound to extend to churchmen who were believed to supply spiritual sanctions for the exploitation of the "Have Nots".

Liaison of the Worst Sort

The verdict of History goes against the alliance of Church and State, not because it is bad in itself, but because it develops a morbid tendency to deteriorate into a liason of the worst kind, and both the parties utilize it not to further public welfare, but to fatten themselves on their unfortunate beneficiaries who sometime go unfed, unclothed and unhoused. Thick as thieves, they not infrequently fall foul of each other on the distribution of the spoils. This again causes great upheaval and the poor folks are made scapegoats. Whether it was a reaction against the early period of tortures and persecutions by the State or some other psychological factor, but it is a fact that ever since the conversion of Constantine, Church has never been content with her spiritual functions. She has always been covertly devising means for riveting fetters on the Kings and asserting her authority even in mundane matters and threatening the breach of her commands with eternal perdition. Weak-kneed monarchs like King John always succumbed to the psychological bluffs of the Popes and agreed to carry out their behests. But the rub came when the priests were up against powerful kings who on their part were eager to put them in their place. But even then they could not curb their hunger for worldly glory. They had, unfortunately for themselves, learnt to live dangerously and they could not disabuse their mind of the newly

acquired lesson. They wanted to have their Church in the close vicinity of the Vesuvius of the State administration. Finding no other means of achieving this end they offered themselves as henchmen of the Monarchs. But all the while, it was to thrust themselves forward rather than to help their masters. Thus they not only belittled themselves, but brought into disrepute the creed they feigned to represent in all their activities. As a bad trellis can ruin a good vine or a poor Government bedevil a civil community, so ecclesiastical institutions worked havoc with religion.

Age of Dictators

In this age of dictatorship, churches have fallen on evil days. Dictators have out-heroded Herod. They are law unto themselves, and their acts betray the philosophy of "after me the deluge." They have overthrown the kings, but they will not stop there. They must have it out with Church once and for all, and would allow the priest class to live only on sufferance. This drive against Church is supported or connived at by the masses who notwithstanding their strong allegiance to religion, have lost all faith in churchmen.

Before the Great War, four Powers controlled the greater part of the European Continent—Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey. These four empires reperesented four different expressions of clericalism. Austria-Hungary supported Catholic clericalism. Russia with Czar as the head of the Church was the seat of orthodoxy. Turkey whose Sultan was the Commander of the Faithful, groaned under the yoke of Mullahism; and Germany under William II, represented Protestant clericalism. Defeat in the Great War was a severe set-back to these four forms of clericalism. These vestiges of the past have had their day. There was a world-wide revolt against priest-craft and it continues to this day. The world has never known such an effervescence as prevails at the present time.

Turkish Transformation

Turkey also witnessed the violent clash of Church and State in the form of Kemal Ataturk's drive against Hodjas who were held responsible for the downfall of Turkey. Henry Elisha Allen in his book *The Turkish Transformation* writes: "a large share of the blame has been handed to the Moslem theologians and doctors whose ignorance and laziness, even dishonesty are said to have changed Islam from a progressive and vital religion to one which emphasizes tradition, form and superstition. Writers have pointed out that while Europe was busy during the Reformation in loosening the hold of decadent clergy, the Ulma, Mullahs and other religious leaders of Islam were hardening Islam into a set of formal practices and closing the gate of any possibility of interpretation which might lead to progressive adaptation." Again the same writer aptly remarks, "The unholy alliance of secular despotism and religious obscurantism is frequently and bitterly criticised. Things might have gone better, it is felt, if religious and secular affairs had been kept apart." Kemal Pasha took the lesson of history to heart and rehabilitated Turkey by exorcising the festering tumour of Mullahism from the body politic. As Sir Muhammad Iqbal points out, "among the Muslim Nations of to-day, Turkey alone has shaken off its dogmatic slumber and attained to self-consciousness." He goes on to say that "most Muslim countries to-day are mechanically repeating old values, whereas the Turk is on the way to creating new values. Some people interpret it as drift from the fold of Islam, and no doubt it is, but the question is "who is to blame!" Priests or the New Regime? The answer is obvious. But for the elimination of reactionary element of Mullahs, Turkey, for long the "Sickman of Europe," would not have gone full steam ahead with new Reforms which have endowed her with prestige and power in the Comity of Nations. In Turkey also the alliance of Church and State has not been all to the good.

Tug-of-War in Germany

While all countries have done with Church-State rivalry, Germany seems to know no quiet. The attitude of the National Socialist Party towards the Christian religion is expounded like so much else in Hitler's book *Mein Kamph.* It has not changed except in so far it has hardened. Of this, there is evidence almost every day. In order to cater to popular weakness for religion, Hitler and his hirelings hold out National Socialism as the future religion of Germany. This new creed is as poles apart from Christianity hence the bleak prospects of any compromise. The German State is out to crush Church and the Vatican has circulated an encyclical to hearten up Catholics. The Confessional Church is also engaged in this fray. What is going to be the end of this struggle no body can say. But this much is certain that the State may change its tactics, but will not give way or relent. No cordial compromise between State and Church is possible. It has not been fruitful anywhere, it can not be otherwise in Germany which swears by the sword and has staged the come-back of Mars. The State which is bent upon settling old scores with external foes, will not spare the internal enemy. The reasons why State will fight the battle to the bitter end are not far to seek. Germans attribute their defeat in the War and the disgraceful treaty of Versailles to the underhand tactics of Church. Of the twenty-five theses of the German religion I give below only a few of them which will show that the new religion is not only diametrically opposite to Christianity, but it is a creed which inculcates active hostility against Church.

New Nazi Faith

The first thesis runs as follows: "The German has his own religion, which flows like the living water of his own perception, feeling and thought, and is rooted in his species. We call it the German religion of the German people and understand

thereby a German faith expressing the peculiarity and integrity of our race. A German commentator, Professor Ernst Bergmann, writes, "where Christianity stops there our religion begins. Belief in a personal God, in revelation and salvation is superstition, not religion. The biologically educated man seeks the solutions of his moral and religious problems in the Cosmos, in nature and the world of reality, in blood and soil, people and home, nation and fatherland.....

"Our religion is no longer the international Christ-God who could not prevent Vessailles. Our religion is what grows living within us the great, sacred, glowing desire to wash away 1,000 years of German sorrow and make good the sins of Jewish-Christian alien religion against the German soul.

"A people which has returned to its blood and soil, which has realised the danger of international Jewry, can no longer tolerate a religion in its churches which makes the scriptures of the Jews the basis of its Gospel. Germania cannot be rebuilt on this inner lie..... .. We must base ourselves on the Holy Scriptures which are clearly written in German hearts..... Our cry is: 'Away from Rome and Jerusalem! Back to our native German Faith in present-day form.'

What is sacred is our home
What is eternal is our people
What is divine is what we want to be."

Church cannot hope to find her feet in a country which believes in unashamed militarism and takes morbid pride in crusading against Religion.

The Ahmadiyya Movement

THE Ahmadiyya Movement was founded by Hazrat Ahmad, the Promised Messiah and Mehdi and the expected Messenger of all nations. In the spirit and power of all the earlier prophets he came to serve and reinterpret the final and eternal teachings laid down by God in the Holy Quran. The Movement therefore represents the true and real Islam and seeks to uplift humanity and establish peace throughout the world. Hazrat Ahmad died in 1908, and the present Head of the Movement is his second successor, Hazrat Mirza Bashir-ud-Din Mahmud Ahmad, under whose direction the Movement has established Missions in many parts of the world, the following being the addresses of some of them:

(1) THE LONDON MOSQUE, 63, Melrose Road,
Southfields, London, S. W. 18, England.

(2) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT IN ISLAM,
56 E, Congress St., Suite 1307,
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. America.

(3) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
P. O. Box 39, Salt Pond,
Gold Coast, West Africa.

(4) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Rose Hill, Mauritius.

(5) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
P. O. Box 727, Lagos,
Nigeria, W. Africa.

(6) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Box No. 305, G. P. O.
Perth, W. Australia.

(7) THE CENTRAL (E.A.) AHMADIYYA
MUSLIM ASSOCIATION,
P. O. Box No. 554, Nairobi
(Kenya Colony).

(8) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Mount Carmel, Haifa, Palestine.

(9) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Defensielijn V/d Bosch, No. 139, Batavia Centrum, Java.

(10) THE AHMADIYYA MOVEMENT,
Padang—(Sumatra).

Regd. No. L.-2942

THE

REVIEW OF RELIGIONS

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

OF SANE MUSLIM RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

DEVOTED TO

THE DIFFUSION AND DISSEMINATION

OF

THE BEAUTIES AND EXCELLENCES

OF

ISLAMIC TEACHING & TORCH-BEARER

OF

THE LIGHT OF ISLAM IN THE WEST.

Gives an Impartial Review of the Prominent Religions of the World and Removes Misconceptions about ISLAM.

Annual Subscription

Inland	... *Rs. 4*
Foreign Countries	... *Sh. 10*

All remittances should be sent to the MANAGER,

THE REVIEW OF RELIGIONS (English)

P. O. Qadian, Punjab (India)

Printed at the Ripon Printing Press, Bull Road, Lahore, by Mirza Mohd. Sadiq and published by Sheikh Abdur Rahman Qadiani for Sadar Anjuman-i-Ahmadiyya Qadian, Punjab, India.